

Commissioner for Patents

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 5 to 13 remain in the application.

Claims 1 and 13 are currently amended.

Claims 2, 3 and 4 are cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended whereby to comply with section 101 and wherein the method is now tied-in with a communication network utilizing computers.

Claim 1 was also amended to overcome the objections under 35 U.S.C. 112. By the cancellation of claim 3, the objections under 35 U.S.C. 112 are overcome.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 to 4, 9 to 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,521,815) when combined with Hall and McGuff (U.S. Patent 6,076,859). As stated by the Examiner, Rose discloses parts of the limitations of claim 1 but does not specifically disclose effecting permanent markings to a plurality of parts of a vehicle and wherein the markings have an alpha numerical code used by the IATA and wherein at least one part of the vehicle has a visible logo. It also does not disclose linking the data bank of the service network to at least one service station, insurance company, police department and national customs, the processing of the collected information and transmitting same to the entities identified above. The Examiner stated that Hall discloses all of the limitations not found in Rose. Applicant does not agree with this contention.

Referring to the Hall reference, it discloses the use of labels using a VIN number which is different from the IATA code which is utilized by International Agencies, and trackable around the world. Hall uses labels which are easily removable and therefore do not offer the security of permanent markings to discourage vehicle theft. Labels are easily removed by thieves. However, in Hall there is a reference to the prior art which uses stencils to provide etching. At column 2 in the paragraph bridging lines 26 to 42, it is described that this etching is formed in a glass surface and that such is not visible to the naked eye but can be made visible only under ultraviolet light. Accordingly, a thief would not see the marking and would proceed to steal a vehicle as there is no form of discouragement visible to the thief during the act of stealing a vehicle.

Commissioner for Patents

As shown in all of the drawings of the Hall patent, they are primarily concerned with the construction of security labels. The Hall reference is not concerned with a method having specific discrete steps involving the permanent marking and the communication of information between elements of a network linking different entities and providing access to information and restricted information in the system. It would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art having knowledge of these two patents to arrive at a specific system as now described by amended claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate therein some hardware limitations and specifically defines a series of steps which are clearly not disclosed by the combination relied upon by the Examiner. Applicant believes that he is entitled to such specifically defined protection in the absence of its teachings by the prior art.

Concerning the Durnford article, such article is well known to the Applicant as the Applicant participated in providing the published information. However, Durnford does not disclose the security network as defined by claim 1 but at that time was only concerned with the etching of a code on various parts of a vehicle.

Applicant believes that in the absence of more pertinent prior art this application should now be in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Pierre-Paul JODOIN

By:



---

April 29, 2009

(Date)

---

Guy J. HOULE (Reg. No. 24,971)

Agent of Record

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

1981 McGill College Avenue, Suite 1600

Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3

Tel.: (514) 847-4321